



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/742,151	12/19/2003	Daryl Carvis Cromer	RPS920030194US1	6014
57736	7590	03/16/2009	EXAMINER	
PATENTS ON DEMAND, P.A. IBM-RSW			TANG, KAREN C	
4581 WESTON ROAD				
SUITE 345			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WESTON, FL 33331			2451	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/16/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/742,151	CROMER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	KAREN C. TANG	2451	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 January 2009.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-19 and 21 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-19 and 21 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) 1-19 and 21 is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

- A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 1/6/09 has been entered.
- Claims 1-19 and 21 are presented for further examination.
- Claims 1, 14-16 are currently amended.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 1/6/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Claim Objections

Claims 1-19 and 21 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claims 1-6 are objected because the term "configured" does not limit the claim scope. Language such as "configured" suggests or makes optional but does not require steps to be performed or does not limit a claim to a particular structure nor does not limit the scope of a claim or claim limitation.

Claims 7-13 are objected because the term "configured" does not limit the claim scope. Language such as "configured" suggests or makes optional but does not require steps to be

performed or does not limit a claim to a particular structure nor does not limit the scope of a claim or claim limitation.

Claims 14-19 and 21 are objected because the term “enabling” does not limits the claim scope. Language such as "configured" suggests or makes optional but does not require steps to be performed or does not limit a claim to a particular structure nor does not limit the scope of a claim or claim limitation.

Claim 17 is objected because it uses acronyms in the claim language without initially providing the complete term. For example, Claim 17 recites the limitation “MIF” should be first introduced as “Management Information Format”

Appropriate correction is required.

Specification

Claim 7-13 are objected to because according to MPEP 608.01, antecedent basis for the terms appearing in the claims, while an applicant is not limited to the nomenclature used in the application as filed, he or she should make appropriate amendment of the specification whenever this nomenclature is departed from by amendment of the claims so as to have clear support or antecedent basis in the specification for the new terms appearing in the claims. Applicant will be required to make appropriate amendment to the description to provide clear support or antecedent basis for the terms appearing in the claims provided no new matter is introduced. The term “Computer Readable Storage Medium” lacks clear support or antecedent basis in the description of the specification. Please also see 37 CFR 1.75 (d)(1).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 7-13 and 14-19, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

A computer program product that comprising instructions which stores on computer readable media (computer readable media is intended to be software, see Page 6, Lines 25-31 of the specification). Therefore, the “computer program product” does not appear to include or embody any functional hardware structure and is considered as program per se, which is not one of categories of statutory subject matter.

A service method (i.e., method), according to page 7, lines 1-5 of the specification, that all the steps of method is performed by the software and does not tie to any particular machine or apparatus, therefore, Claims 14-19 and 21 does not fall into any one of categories of statutory subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described

in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

There is no written support within the specification supporting "wherein the mobile system configured to remain in the powered down state while". Correction is required.

Claim 7-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

There is no written support within the specification supporting "...for the request for asset information while the powered-down mobile system remains powered down.". Correction is required.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

It is ambiguous and contradicting for applicant to claimed it is the "wireless network adaptor" that is configured to respond to discovery of the stored request by retrieving the request information while applicant's own specification (i.e., see abstract, page 9, Lines 5-9) has indicates that it is the mobile device/system that is performing the act of responds (e.g., mobile

system response to discovery of the stored request by retrieving the requested information from nonvolatile storage of the mobile system and transmitting the requested information via the wireless network adaptor to the access point and subsequently returned to the powered down state, Also, evidently in Claim 21 of the claim limitation that it is the "mobile client" or "mobile system" that is associated with the access point). Furthermore, in the light of applicant's specification, when the mobile system powered up the wireless network adaptor, the wireless network adaptor is a part of mobile system (see specification, page 4, Lines 3-10), therefore, the mobile system is powered up.

Due to the contradiction by the specification and abstracts, for the examining purposes, the is reasonable to interprets that it is the "mobile system" that "response to discovery of the stored request by retrieving the requested information from nonvolatile storage of the mobile system and transmitting the requested information via the wireless network adaptor to the access point and subsequently returned to the powered down state."

Correction is required.

It is considered to be indefinite that applicant stated it is the "mobile system to remained in the powered down state while the wireless network adaptor is responding to the discovery of the stored request.."

As indicated above, as submitted by applicant and supported by the specification (see pages 4, Lines 3-10) that NIC/wireless network adaptor is part of the mobile system. The mobile system cannot be both powered down and be power up at the same time, therefore, for examining purpose, the limitation (see claim 3 for example) is interpreted as "the mobile system is

responding to the discovery of the stored request by retrieving the requested information from nonvolatile storage.." as supported by the specification (see pages 4, Lines 22-15).

Claim the 21 is unclear because it appears that the "mobile system" and "a subsequent mobile client" are two separate entities. However, in light of the specification as well as claim 12, the mobile system and "a subsequent mobile client" must be a same entity. Therefore, for examining purpose, Claim 21 is interpreted as "...enabling the mobile system to query the access point during the power on of the mobile system causing the mobile system to associate with the access point"

Correction is required.

Claim 7 contains negative limitations which does not have basis in the original disclosure and must be positively recited in the specification. See MEPE 2173.05 (h)

For examining purpose, the negative limitation such as "without waking the power-down mobile system" is therefore omitted.

Claim 8 contains negative limitations which does not have basis in the original disclosure and must be positively recited in the specification. See MEPE 2173.05 (h)

For examining purpose, the negative limitation such as "without placing the mobile system in a power-on state" is therefore omitted.

Correction is required.

Claim 7 recites the limitation "power-down mobile system" in Lines 6. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 21 recites the limitation "the client" in Lines 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3-10, 14, and 19, 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fischer (US 7,324,468) in view of Hitt (US 2004/0100394).

1. Referring to Claim 1, Fischer discloses a data processing network configuration comprising:

an access point configured to receive and store a request to retrieve information from a mobile system associated with the access point (refer to Col 5, Lines 58-67);
a mobile system having a wireless network adapter, and the wireless network adaptor being configured to periodically wake from a powered down state (refer to Col 11, Lines 37-46, Col 6, Lines 25-28);

wherein the wireless network adapter configured to respond to discovery of the stored request by retrieving the requested information from the nonvolatile storage of the mobile system (Col 12, Lines 55-65 and Col 13, Lines 1-11) and transmitted the requested information via the

wireless network adaptor to the access point and subsequently returned to the powered down state in response to the transmitting the requested information (refer to Col 12, Lines 40-50);

Although Fischer disclosed the invention substantially as claimed, Fischer did not explicitly disclosing "pull the information from a device to discover the stored request for information on the device"

Hitt, in analogous art disclosing "pull the information from a device to discover the stored request for information on the device (refer to 0077 and 0070)"

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Fischer and Hitt because Hitt's teaching of "pull the information from a device to discover the stored request for information on the device" would improve Fischer's system efficiency by obtaining the real-time detection of needs.

2. Referring to Claim 3, Fischer and Hitt disclosed the network of claims 1, Fischer discloses wherein the mobile system is further configured, when in a powered down state, to periodically wake up the wireless network adapter (refer to Col 11, Lines 37-46, Col 6, Lines 25-28), wherein the mobile system is configured to remain in the powered down state while the wireless network adaptor is responding to the discovery of the stored request by retrieving the requested information from the nonvolatile storage, and wherein the nonvolatile storage is connected directly to the wireless network adaptor via a system management bus (refer to Col 12, Lines 60-67)

Although Fischer disclosed the invention substantially as claimed, Fischer did not explicitly disclosing "pull the information from a device for request "

Hitt, in analogous art disclosing “pull the information from a device for request (refer to 0077 and 0070)”

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Fischer and Hitt because Hitt’s teaching of “pull the information from a device for request ” would improve Fischer’s system efficiency by obtaining the real-time detection of needs.

3. Referring to Claim 4, Fischer and Hitt disclosed the network of claims 1.

Fischer further disclosing that wherein the access point is configured to store the pending request in a table having an entry for each mobile system associated with the access point wherein each entry in the request contains address of the corresponding mobile system’s wireless network adaptor (refer to Col 7, Lines 30-43).

4. Referring to Claim 5, Fischer and Hitt disclosed the network of claim 1.

Fischer further disclosing that wherein the access point is configured to store the pending request in a table having an entry for each mobile system associated with the access point wherein each entry in the request contains address of the corresponding mobile system’s wireless network adaptor (refer to Col 7, Lines 30-43), wherein asset information from the mobile system is stored in the allocated entry associated with the mobile system (refer to Col 5, Lines 57-65).

5. Referring to Claim 6, Fischer and Hitt disclosed the network of claim 1.

Fischer further disclosing that wherein the access point is further configured to store asset information of the mobile system in the table of the access point (refer to Col 7, Lines 30-40).

6. Referring to Claim 7, Fischer discloses a computer program product for remotely retrieving information from a powered-down mobile data processing system, the program product comprising processor executable instructions stored on computer readable media comprising:

computer readable storage medium containing code which configures an access point to store a server request to asset information from the power-down mobile system wherein the power-down mobile system is associated with the access point and has a wireless network adaptor (refer to Col 5, Lines 58-67);

computer readable storage medium containing code which configures the wireless network adaptor to periodically wake from a powered down state (refer to Col 11, Lines 37-46, Col 6, Lines 25-28);

computer readable storage medium containing code which configures the wireless network adaptor to retrieve the asset information and forward the retrieved information to the access point in response to detecting the stored request for asset information (refer to Col 12, Lines 55-65 and Col 13, Lines 1-11 and Col 14, Lines 55-67), and wherein the wireless network adaptor returns to the power-down state subsequent to forwarding the retrieved information (refer to Col 12, Lines 55-65 and Col 13, Lines 1-11);

computer readable storage medium containing code which configures the wireless network adapter to retrieve the asset information and forward the retrieved information to the

access point in response to detecting the stored request for asset information (refer to Col 12, Lines 55-65 and Col 13, Lines 1-11 and Col 14, Lines 55-67);

Although Fischer disclosed the invention substantially as claimed, Fischer did not explicitly disclosing “pull the information from a device to discover the stored request for information on the device”

Hitt, in analogous art disclosing “pull the information from a device to discover the stored request for information on the device (refer to 0077 and 0070)”

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Fischer and Hitt because Hitt’s teaching of “pull the information from a device to discover the stored request for information on the device” would improve Fischer’s system efficiency by obtaining the real-time detection of needs.

7. Referring to Claim 8, Fischer and Hitt disclosed the computer program product of claim 7.

Fischer further discloses that wherein the computer readable storage medium containing code which configures the mobile system to retrieve the asset information contain code to configure the mobile system to access the asset information from nonvolatile storage on the mobile system while the network adapter is powered on (refer to Col 12, Lines 60-67); wherein the nonvolatile storage is connected directly to the wireless network adaptor via a system management bus (), and wherein the computer readable storage medium containing code which configures the mobile system to retrieve the asset information (refer to Col 12, Lines 60-67) further contains code to

configure the mobile system to forward the retrieved information (refer to Col 14, Lines 55-65)
without placing the mobile system in a power-on state;

8. Referring to Claim 9, Fischer and Hitt disclosed the computer program product of claims 7, Fischer further discloses wherein the mobile system is further configured, when in a powered down state, to periodically wake up the wireless network adapter (refer to Col 11, Lines 37-46, Col 6, Lines 25-28), wherein the mobile system is configured to remain in the powered down state while the wireless network adaptor is responding to the discovery of the stored request by retrieving the requested information from the nonvolatile storage, and wherein the nonvolatile storage is connected directly to the wireless network adaptor via a system management bus (refer to Col 12, Lines 60-67)

Although Fischer disclosed the invention substantially as claimed, Fischer did not explicitly disclosing "pull the information from a device for request" Hitt, in analogous art disclosing "pull the information from a device for request (refer to 0077 and 0070)"

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Fischer and Hitt because Hitt's teaching of "pull the information from a device for request" would improve Fischer's system efficiency by obtaining the real-time detection of needs.

9. Referring to Claim 10, Fischer and Hitt disclosed the computer program product of claims 7.

Fischer further discloses wherein the computer readable storage medium containing code which configures the access point to store the server request containing code which configures the mobile system to store the request in a table on the access point having an entry for each mobile system associated with access point (refer to Col 5, Lines 58-67 and refer to Col 7, Lines 30-40)

10. Referring to Claim 14, Fischer discloses service method for enabling a server to remotely access data from a powered down mobile data processing system, the method comprising:

enabling the server to transmit a request to retrieve information from a mobile system (refer to Col 7, Lines 30-56);

enabling an access point associated with the mobile system to recognize the request and to store information indicative of the request on the access point if the request is addressed to a mobile system associated with the access point which is presently powered down (refer to Col 7, Lines 30-56 and Col 7, Lines 60-67);

enabling the wireless network adaptor of the mobile system, responsive to detecting the stored request for information from the server, to retrieve the requested information and to transmit the requested information to the server through the access point, and subsequently return to a powered down state (refer to Col 12, Lines 55-65 and Col 13, Lines 1-11 and Col 14, Lines 55-67);

Although Fischer disclosed the invention substantially as claimed, Fischer did not explicitly disclosing "pull the information from a device to discover the stored request for information on the device by waking only a wireless network adapter of the mobile system "

Hitt, in analogous art disclosing “pull the information from a device to discover the stored request for information on the device by waking only a wireless network adapter of the mobile system ((refer to 0077 and 0070)”

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Fischer and Hitt because Hitt’s teaching of “pull the information from a device to discover the stored request for information on the device by waking only a wireless network adapter of the mobile system ” would improve Fischer's system efficiency by obtaining the real-time detection of needs.

11. Referring to Claim 19, Fischer and Hitt disclosed service method of claim 14, Fischer further disclosing enabling the mobile client to retrieve the information includes enabling the wireless adapter to retrieve data from nonvolatile storage directly connected to the wireless network adapter via a system management bus (refer to Col 12, Lines 60-67).

12. Referring to Claim 21, Fischer and Hitt discloses the service of claim 14, Fischer further discloses wherein enabling the mobile client to query the access point, comprises enabling the client to query the access point during a subsequent mobile client power on event causing the mobile client to associate with the access point (refer to Col 12, Lines 40-50).

Claims 2, 13, 15, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fischer (US 7,324,468) in view of Hitt (US 2004/0100394) and in further view of “Wake On Lane – An Overview” hereinafter WOL.

13. Referring to Claims 2, Fischer and Hitt disclosed the network of claim 1. Although Fischer and Hitt disclosed the invention substantially as claimed, Fischer and Hitt did not explicitly stating “wherein the access point is configured to recognize the request as a packet containing a media access control (MAC) address repeated multiple times and an appended control field.”

WOL, in analogous art, disclosing, “wherein the access point is configured to recognize the request as a packet containing a media access control (MAC) address repeated multiple times and an appended control field. (refer to Page 1, paragraph 5, WOL further disclosed that the technology could be used on the network interface to signal the device to turn itself on, and the device is a remote device, refer to Page 1, par 2)”

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Fischer, Hitt and WOL because WOL’s teaching of “wherein the access point is configured to recognize the request as a packet containing a media access control (MAC) address repeated multiple times and an appended control field ” would improve Fischer and Hitt’s system efficiency by allowing server to access information without perform various medium access activities (see Fischer, Col 14, Lines 13-25).

14. Referring to Claims 13, Fischer and Hitt disclosed the computer program product of claim 7. Although Fischer and Hitt disclosed the invention substantially as claimed, Fischer and Hitt did not explicitly stating “wherein the access point is configured to recognize the request as a packet containing a media access control (MAC) address repeated multiple times and an appended control field.”

WOL, in analogous art, disclosing, “wherein the access point is configured to recognize the request as a packet containing a media access control (MAC) address repeated multiple times and an appended control field. (refer to Page 1, paragraph 5, WOL further disclosed that the technology could be used on the network interface to signal the device to turn itself on, and the device is a remote device, refer to Page 1, par 2)”

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Fischer, Hitt and WOL because WOL’s teaching of “wherein the access point is configured to recognize the request as a packet containing a media access control (MAC) address repeated multiple times and an appended control field ” would improve Fischer and Hitt’s system efficiency by allowing server to access information without perform various medium access activities (see Fischer, Col 14, Lines 13-25).

15. Referring to Claims 15, Fischer and Hitt disclosed the service method of claim 14. Although Fischer and Hitt disclosed the invention substantially as claimed, Fischer and Hitt did not explicitly stating “wherein the access point is configured to recognize the request as a packet containing a media access control (MAC) address repeated multiple times and an appended control field.”

WOL, in analogous art, disclosing, “wherein the access point is configured to recognize the request as a packet containing a media access control (MAC) address repeated multiple times and an appended control field. (refer to Page 1, paragraph 5, WOL further disclosed that the technology could be used on the network interface to signal the device to turn itself on, and the device is a remote device, refer to Page 1, par 2)”

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Fischer, Hitt and WOL because WOL’s teaching of “wherein the access point is configured to recognize the request as a packet containing a media access control (MAC) address repeated multiple times and an appended control field ” would improve Fischer and Hitt’s system efficiency by allowing server to access information without perform various medium access activities (see Fischer, Col 14, Lines 13-25).

16. Referring to Claim 16, Fischer, Hitt and WOL disclose the service method of claim 16, Fischer further disclosing that wherein the access point is configured to store the pending request in a table having an entry for each mobile system associated with the access point wherein each entry in the request contains address of the corresponding mobile system’s wireless network adaptor (refer to Col 7, Lines 30-43).

Although Fischer and Hitt discloses the invention substantially as claimed, Fischer and Hitt are silent in regarding “wherein each table entry contains a MAC address of the corresponding wireless network adapter”.

WOL, in an analogous discloses, wherein entry contains a MAC address of the corresponding wireless network adapter (refer to page 2);

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Fischer, Hitt and WOL because WOL's teaching of "wherein each table entry contains a MAC address of the corresponding wireless network adapter" would improve Fischer and Hitt's system efficiency by allowing server to access information without perform various medium access activities (see Fischer, Col 14, Lines 13-25).

Claims 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fischer (US 7,324,468) in view of Hitt (US 2004/0100394) and in further view of Cromer et al hereinafter Cromer (US 6,381,636)

17. Referring to Claim 11, Fischer and Hitt disclosed the computer program product of claim 10.

Although Fischer and Hitt disclosed the invention substantially as claimed, Fischer and Hitt did not explicitly disclosing "wherein each table entry contains a MAC address of the corresponding wireless network adapter."

Cromer, in an analogous disclosing "wherein entry contains a MAC address of the corresponding wireless network adapter (refer to Col 6, Lines 29-43);"

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Fischer, Hitt and Cromer because Cromer's teaching of "wherein each table entry contains a MAC address of the corresponding wireless network adapter" would improve Fischer, Hitt's system efficiency by allowing server to access information without perform various medium access activities (see Fischer, Col 14, Lines 13-25).

18. Referring to Claim 12, Fischer, Hitt and Cromer disclosed the computer program product of claim 11.

Fischer further discloses wherein the mobile system stores its asset information in the table and computer readable storage medium containing code which configures the access point to store the asset information further contains code to configure the access point to, responsive to a subsequent request for the mobile system's asset information, service the request using asset information stored at the access point (refer to Col 12, Lines 40-50);

Claims 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fischer (US 7,324,468) in view of Hitt (US 2004/0100394) and in further view of "Wake On Lane – An Overview" hereinafter WOL and Cromer et al hereinafter Cromer (US 6,381,636)

19. Referring to Claim 17. Fischer, Hitt and WOL disclosed the service method of Claim 16.

Although Fischer, Hitt and WOL discloses the invention substantially as claimed. Fischer, Hitt and WOL did not expressly disclose "wherein each entry in the table is further enabled to store the corresponding mobile system's MIF asset information."

Cromer, in an analogous art, disclosing "wherein each entry in the table is further enabled to store the corresponding mobile system's MIF asset information (refer to Col 1, Lines 63-67)."

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Fischer, Hitt, WOL and Cromer because Cromer's teaching of "wherein each entry in the table is further enabled to store the corresponding mobile system's MIF asset

information" would improve Fischer, Hitt and WOL' system efficiency by allowing server to access information without perform various medium access activities (see Fischer, Col 14, Lines 13-25).

20. Referring to Claim 18. Fischer, Hitt, WOL and Cromer disclosed the service method of Claim 17. Although Fischer, Hitt, and WOL discloses the invention substantially as claimed. Fischer, Hitt and WOL did not expressly disclose "wherein the server request is a request for the mobile client's asset information and wherein the access point services the request itself if the table contains a valid copy of the mobile client's asset information".

Cromer, in an analogous art discloses "wherein the server request is a request for the mobile client's asset information and wherein the access point services the request itself if the table contains a valid copy of the mobile client's asset information (refer to Col 1, Lines 50-65)."

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Fischer, Hitt, WOL and Cromer because Cromer's teaching of "wherein the server request is a request for the mobile client's asset information and wherein the access point services the request itself if the table contains a valid copy of the mobile client's asset information" would improve Fischer, Hitt and WOL' system efficiency by allowing server to access information without perform various medium access activities (see Fischer, Col 14, Lines 13-25).

Conclusion

Examiner's Notes: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner. In the case of amending the claimed invention, Applicant is respectfully requested to indicate the portion(s) of the specification which dictate(s) the structure relied on for proper interpretation and also to verify and ascertain the metes and bounds of the claimed invention.

A shortened statutory period for reply to this Office action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Karen C. Tang whose telephone number is (571)272-3116. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7 - 3.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571)272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information

Art Unit: 2451

for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Karen C Tang/

Examiner, Art Unit 2451